

W. 9. D. 4.

AGENDA COVER MEMO

Memorandum Date: November 30, 2005

Order Date: December 14, 2005

TO: Lane County Board of Commissioners

DEPT: Public Works

PRESENTED BY: Phillip Guyette, Public Works Fleet Manager

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: In the Matter of Awarding a Contract to Northwest Volvo Trucks, Inc., for the Purchase of One (1), new Diesel-Powered Truck with Hydraulic Roll-Off Container System, with Two (2) Trade-Ins, Contract FY05/06 FS-06.

I. MOTION

MOVE TO AWARD A CONTRACT TO NORTHWEST VOLVO TRUCKS, INC., IN THE AMOUNT OF \$100,253.50, FOR THE PURCHASE OF ONE (1) NEW, DIESEL POWERED TRUCK WITH HYDRAULIC ROLL-OFF CONTAINER SYSTEM, AS SPECIFIED IN CONTRACT FY05/06 FS-06.

II. ISSUE OR PROBLEM

Shall Lane County approve awarding a contract to Northwest Volvo Trucks, Inc., for the purchase of One (1), new Diesel-Powered Truck with Hydraulic Roll-Off Container System, required by Public Works Waste Management Division?

III. BACKGROUND/IMPLICATIONS OF ACTION

A. Board Action and Other History

Lane County Department of Public Works Waste Management Division presently operates three (3) trucks with hydraulic roll-off container systems. These trucks transport solid waste containers from rural transfer sites to the landfill at Short Mountain. The oldest unit has been in service 10-years with more than 10,000 hours of operation. It is beginning to experience increased downtime resulting from mechanical failures and will require a major overhaul if not replaced. These equipment units have a typical lifecycle of 10-years or 9,000 hours.

B. Policy Issues

None

C. Board Goals

Purchase of this equipment is necessary to provide direct and indirect services to the citizens of Lane County, to maintain satisfactory operations of the County's road system, and to meet the health, safety, and economic good of the citizens and industries of our community as defined in Section B3.a.2 of the Strategic Plan.

D. Financial and/or Resource Considerations

This equipment unit was approved for purchase in the Fleet Services FY05/06 budget, sufficient funds are available for this purchase, and the purchase price is within the budgeted amount.

E. Analysis

The County received two (2) responses from its invitation to bid. The low bid of \$100,253.50, with two (2) trade-ins, was submitted by Northwest Volvo Trucks, Inc., with several minor acceptable deviations from the published specifications.

F. Alternatives/Options

1. Purchase the above described equipment unit from Northwest Volvo Trucks, Inc., at this time.
2. Do not purchase at this time. The hydraulic roll-off container truck scheduled for replacement is nearing the end of its economic life. Mechanical breakdowns are occurring more frequently and service parts are becoming more difficult to obtain for this ten-year old equipment unit.

IV. Timing/Implementation

Upon approval of the Board, a contract will be executed between Northwest Volvo Trucks, Inc., and the County Administrator.

V. Recommendation

It is recommended that the Board approve entering into a contract with Northwest Volvo Trucks, Inc., for the purchase of one (1) new, Diesel-Powered Truck with Hydraulic Roll-Off Container System as specified in FY05/06 F06.

IV. Follow-up

None.

V. Attachments

Board Order

Bid Recap

IN THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF LANE COUNTY
STATE OF OREGON

ORDER

(IN THE MATTER OF AWARDING A
(CONTRACT TO NORTHWEST VOLVO
(TRUCKS, INC. IN THE AMOUNT OF
(\$100,253.50 FOR THE PURCHASE OF
(ONE (1), NEW, DIESEL-POWERED
(TRUCK WITH HYDRAULIC ROLL-OFF
(CONTAINER SYSTEM, WITH TWO (2)
(TRADE-INS, CONTRACT FY05/06 FS-06.

WHEREAS, at the duly publicized place and time on November 22, 2005, an authorized representative of the Department of Public Works, opened bids on the following:

One (1), New Diesel-Powered Truck with Hydraulic Roll-Off
Container System, with Two (2) Trade-Ins, Contract FY05/06 FS-06

WHEREAS, the lowest responsive bidder with several minor acceptable deviation was submitted by Northwest Volvo Trucks, Inc. in the amount of \$100,253.50, with two (2) trade-ins, and the Director of the Department of Public Works recommends that the bid be accepted; therefore it is hereby

ORDERED that the bid received from Northwest Volvo Trucks, Inc. be accepted as recommended; and it is further

ORDERED that a contract be awarded to Northwest Volvo Trucks, Inc. in the amount of \$100,253.50 in accordance with the bid specifications; and it is further

ORDERED, that a contract be executed in accordance with this Order and the bid specifications and the County Administrator be authorized to sign the contract.

DATED this 14th day of December, 2005.

Anna Morrison, Chair
Lane County Board of Commissioners

APPROVED

12-6-05



IN THE MATTER OF AWARDING A CONTRACT TO NORTHWEST VOLVO TRUCKS, INC. IN THE AMOUNT OF \$100,253.50 FOR THE PURCHASE OF ONE (1), NEW, DIESEL-POWERED TRUCK WITH HYDRAULIC ROLL-OFF CONTAINER SYSTEM, WITH TWO (2) TRADE-INS, CONTRACT FY05/06 FS-06.

CONTRACT FY05/06 FS-06**Bid Opening: Tuesday, November 22, 2005****BID RECAP****ONE (1), NEW, UNUSED CURRENT-MODEL, 58,000 GVW, 6X4, DIESEL-POWERED TRUCK WITH HYDRAULIC ROLL-OFF CONTAINER SYSTEM AND AUTOMATIC TARTER WITH TWO (2) TRADE-IN'S.**

<u>VENDOR</u>	<u>MAKE/MODEL #</u>	<u>QUANTITY</u>	<u>TOTAL COST</u>	<u>BID BOND/CHECK</u>
Northwest Volvo Trucks	D7 VHD64B	1	\$122,753.50	Bid Bond
Trade-in Unit:	ASSET # 93109	4V2JCBLE3PR821790	\$ 17,500.00	
	n/a	HH-207 Tilt-Frame Assembly	\$ 5,000.00	
		NET BID AMOUNT	\$100,253.50	
<hr/>				
Farwest Truck Center	CL 120	1	\$122,792.00	Bid Bond
Trade-in Unit:	ASSET # 93109	4V2JCBLE3PR821790	\$ 18,500.00	
	n/a	HH-207 Tilt-Frame Assembly	\$ 4,000.00	
		NET BID AMOUNT	\$100,292.00	
<hr/>				

FILE NOTE

AGENDA DATE: December 14, 2005

TO: Lane County Board of Commissioners

FROM: Trina Laidlaw, Assistant County Counsel

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: ORDER _____/IN THE MATTER OF AMENDING
CHAPTER 60 OF LANE MANUAL TO REVISE CERTAIN
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES FEES (LM 60.840)
EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 2006

The purpose of this file note is to advise the Board of a risk concerning the amendment to the Community Health Centers (FQHC) sliding scale/flat fee discount, at this time. LM 60.840(10) states, in part:

"The minimum fee and discounted sliding fee schedule is reviewed, revised as necessary, and approved on an annual basis by the Board of County Commissioners."

According to the Department, this is the first time since February 2004 (when the current sliding fee scale was established) that the Board has been specifically requested to review and revise this sliding fee schedule, or 22 months. However, last June/July, the Department presented its 2005 annual fee schedule revision, effective July 1, 2005. The June/July item included adding a sentence immediately preceding the above quoted sentence in LM 60.840(10): "Fees for lab, pharmacy and durable medical equipment and supplies may be added to the minimum fee and/or discounted fee,." and was part of the section discussing the sliding fee schedule. But, the Department did not specifically request the Board review or revise the actual sliding scale in LM 60.840(10) last June/July 2005.

Analysis:

1. The Board has probably not "reviewed, revised as necessary, and approved on an annual basis" the actual minimum fee and discounted sliding fee schedule since February 2004. This agenda item could be considered the first such "review, revision and approval" of this schedule.
2. Last June/July 2005, the Board did consider and approve a revision to LM 60.840(10), but not specifically to the sliding fee scale itself. There is an argument that the agenda item in June/July was the "review, revision as necessary, and approval on an annual basis" of the sliding fee schedule because the Board did consider and approve another change to LM 60.840(10): that fees for lab, pharmacy, etc. be added to the minimum or discounted fee on the sliding fee scale. An argument could be made that if the Board considered adding fees for a new type of work (lab, pharmacy, etc.) to the minimum fee/ sliding scale, the Board may have also reviewed the sliding fee scale itself, and decided no further changes were necessary. There apparently had not been

a separate annual process for the Board to "review, revise as necessary and approve" of the sliding scale itself.

3. The difficulty with the argument in 2. above is that, in reality, the Board probably did not review the sliding fee scale last June/July 2005. It was not asked to do this, and it was not necessary to the decision. The Board could decide to add fees for a new type of work without looking specifically at the methodology of the sliding fee scale, as this agenda item addresses.

Conclusion: While an argument could be made that the Board's consideration of the Department's general fee schedule revision last June/July was the annual "review, revise as necessary, and approval" of the specific sliding scale in LM 60.840(10), a better argument is that it was not such an annual review. A better argument is that this agenda item presents the Board with its opportunity for an annual review of the minimum fee and discounted sliding fee schedule, and the Department should be cautioned to either present the schedule to the Board annually or suggest amendment to the annual review requirement.